

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)
Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Phone: 877-206-4741
Fax: 866-633-0228
tfriedman@toddflaw.com
abacon@toddflaw.com
mgeorge@toddflaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TERRI ALVES, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff,
vs.
ONE WAY FUNDING, LLC, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them, Defendant.

) Case No.
)
)
) CLASS ACTION
)
**) COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF:**
)
)
1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]
2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]
3. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(c)]
4. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(c)]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff TERRI ALVES (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all
 2 others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based
 3 upon personal knowledge:

4 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
 6 similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable
 7 remedies resulting from the illegal actions of ONE WAY FUNDING, LLC
 8 (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on
 9 Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection
 10 Act, *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.* (“TCPA”) and related regulations, specifically the
 11 National Do-Not-Call provisions, thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy.

12 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

13 2. Jurisdiction is proper under *28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)* because Plaintiff,
 14 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at
 15 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a New
 16 York company. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in
 17 violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the
 18 thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction.
 19 Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class
 20 Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

21 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central
 22 District of California pursuant to *28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2)* because Defendant does
 23 business within the State of California and Plaintiff resides within the County of
 24 San Luis Obispo.

25 **PARTIES**

26 4. Plaintiff, TERRI ALVES (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing in
 27 Shell Beach, California and is a “person” as defined by *47 U.S.C. § 153 (39)*.

28 5. Defendant, ONE WAY FUNDING, LLC (“Defendant”) is a business

¹ funding company, and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

2 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are
3 collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the
4 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are
5 currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious
6 names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible
7 for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the
8 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when
9 such identities become known.

10 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and
11 every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other
12 Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or
13 employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.
14 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained
15 of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

17 8. Beginning in or around February of 2017, Defendant contacted
18 Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -7441, in an attempt to
19 solicit Plaintiff to purchase Defendant's services.

20 9. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system” as defined
21 by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its call to Plaintiff seeking to solicit its services.

22 10. Defendant contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff from telephone
23 numbers, including without limitation (516) 336-8254 and (516) 629-5215,
24 confirmed to be Defendant's number.

25 11. Defendant's calls constituted calls that were not for emergency
26 purposes as defined by *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)*.

27 12. Defendant's calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a
28 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls

1 pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)*.

2 13. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff's "prior
 3 express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an
 4 artificial or prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §*
 5 *227(b)(1)(A)*.

6 14. Further, Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -7441 was
 7 added to the National Do-Not-Call Registry on or about December 2, 2003.

8 15. Defendant placed multiple calls soliciting its business to Plaintiff on
 9 his cellular telephone ending in -7441 in or around February of 2017.

10 16. Such calls constitute solicitation calls pursuant to *47 C.F.R. §*
 11 *64.1200(c)(2)* as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendant's services.

12 17. Plaintiff received numerous solicitation calls from Defendant within a
 13 12-month period.

14 18. Defendant continued to call Plaintiff in an attempt to solicit its
 15 services and in violation of the National Do-Not-Call provisions of the TCPA.

16 19. Upon information and belief, and based on Plaintiff's experiences of
 17 being called by Defendant after being on the National Do-Not-Call list for several
 18 years prior to Defendant's initial call, and at all relevant times, Defendant failed to
 19 establish and implement reasonable practices and procedures to effectively prevent
 20 telephone solicitations in violation of the regulations prescribed under *47 U.S.C. §*
 21 *227(c)(5)*.

22 CLASS ALLEGATIONS

23 20. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
 24 similarly situated, as a member the two proposed classes (hereafter, jointly, "The
 25 Classes").

26 21. The class concerning the ATDS claim for no prior express consent
 27 (hereafter "The ATDS Class") is defined as follows:

1 All persons within the United States who received any
2 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from
3 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made
4 through the use of any automatic telephone dialing
5 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such
6 person had not previously consented to receiving such
calls within the four years prior to the filing of this
Complaint

7 22. The class concerning the National Do-Not-Call violation (hereafter
8 "The DNC Class") is defined as follows:

9 All persons within the United States registered on the
10 National Do-Not-Call Registry for at least 30 days, who
11 had not granted Defendant prior express consent nor had
12 a prior established business relationship, who received
13 more than one call made by or on behalf of Defendant
14 that promoted Defendant's products or services, within
15 any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the
filing of the complaint.

16 23. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The ATDS Class, consisting
17 of all persons within the United States who received any collection telephone calls
18 from Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any
19 automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such
20 person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to
21 Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

22 24. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The DNC Class, consisting
23 of all persons within the United States registered on the National Do-Not-Call
24 Registry for at least 30 days, who had not granted Defendant prior express consent
25 nor had a prior established business relationship, who received more than one call
26 made by or on behalf of Defendant that promoted Defendant's products or services,
27 within any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the filing of the
28

1 complaint.

2 25. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Classes.
3 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Classes, but believes the
4 Classes members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should
5 be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

6 26. The Classes are so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its
7 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Classes
8 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through
9 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
10 The Classes includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Classes
11 members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

12 27. Plaintiff and members of The ATDS Class were harmed by the acts of
13 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff
14 and ATDS Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff
15 and ATDS Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for
16 which Plaintiff and ATDS Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve
17 or administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading
18 the privacy of said Plaintiff and ATDS Class members.

19 28. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The
20 ATDS Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual
21 members of The ATDS Class. These common legal and factual questions, which
22 do not vary between ATDS Class members, and which may be determined without
23 reference to the individual circumstances of any ATDS Class members, include,
24 but are not limited to, the following:

25 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this
26 Complaint, Defendant made any telemarketing/solicitation call
27 (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with
28 the prior express consent of the called party) to a ATDS Class

1 member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any
2 artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number
3 assigned to a cellular telephone service;

- 4 b. Whether Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members were damaged
5 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
6 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such
7 conduct in the future.

8 29. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls
9 from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or
10 prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting
11 claims that are typical of The ATDS Class.

12 30. Plaintiff and members of The DNC Class were harmed by the acts of
13 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff
14 and DNC Class members via their telephones for solicitation purposes, thereby
15 invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the DNC Class members whose telephone
16 numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. Plaintiff and the DNC Class
17 members were damaged thereby.

18 31. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The
19 DNC Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual
20 members of The DNC Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do
21 not vary between DNC Class members, and which may be determined without
22 reference to the individual circumstances of any DNC Class members, include, but
23 are not limited to, the following:

- 24 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this
25 Complaint, Defendant or its agents placed more than one
26 solicitation call to the members of the DNC Class whose
27 telephone numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry
28 and who had not granted prior express consent to Defendant and

1 did not have an established business relationship with
2 Defendant;

- 3 b. Whether Defendant obtained prior express written consent to
4 place solicitation calls to Plaintiff or the DNC Class members'
5 telephones;
- 6 c. Whether Plaintiff and the DNC Class member were damaged
7 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- 8 d. Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from
9 engaging in such conduct in the future.

10 32. As a person that received numerous solicitation calls from Defendant
11 within a 12-month period, who had not granted Defendant prior express consent
12 and did not have an established business relationship with Defendant, Plaintiff is
13 asserting claims that are typical of the DNC Class.

14 33. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members
15 of The Classes. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of
16 class actions.

17 34. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and
18 efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims
19 of all Classes members is impracticable. Even if every Classes member could
20 afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly
21 burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would
22 proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying,
23 inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense
24 to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same
25 complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action
26 presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and
27 of the court system, and protects the rights of each Classes member.

28 35. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Classes members

1 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical
2 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Classes members not parties to
3 such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such
4 non-party Class members to protect their interests.

5 36. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable
6 to The Classes, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard
7 to the members of the Classes as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227(b).

On Behalf of the ATDS Class

12 37. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action
13 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-36.

14 38. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
15 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
16 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*, and in particular
17 *47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)*.

18 39. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*,
19 Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory
20 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)*.

21 40. Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are also entitled to and seek
22 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection

Act

47 U.S.C. §227(b)

On Behalf of the ATDS Class

41. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action

1 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-36.

2 42. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
3 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not
4 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*,
5 and in particular *47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)*.

6 43. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47
7 U.S.C. § 227(b), Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled an award of
8 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.
9 § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

10 44. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive
11 relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227(c)

On Behalf of the DNC Class

16 45. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action
17 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-36.

18 46. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
19 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
20 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(c)*, and in particular
21 *47 U.S.C. § 227 (c)(5)*.

22 47. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227(c)*,
23 Plaintiff and the DNC Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory
24 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B)*.

25 48. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek
26 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

27 | //

28 | //

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

On Behalf of the DNC Class

49. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-36.

50. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(c)*, in particular *47 U.S.C. § 227 (c)(5)*.

51. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

52. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227(b)

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B)*.
 - Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection**
3 **Act**

4 **47 U.S.C. §227(b)**

- 5 • As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C)*.
- 6 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

9 **47 U.S.C. §227(c)**

- 10 • As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(c)(5)*, Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. 227(c)(5)*.
- 11 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

12 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection**

14 **Act**

15 **47 U.S.C. §227(c)**

- 16 • As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(c)(5)*, Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §227(c)(5)*.
- 17 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

53. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted this 3rd Day of March, 2017.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman
Todd M. Friedman
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman
Attorney for Plaintiff